Member's Representation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟಗಿರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಮತ್ತು ನಾನು ಬರಗಾಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕಳಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅದೇ ವಿಷಯ ನಾವು 2½ ಗಂಟೆ ಕಾಲ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹರಿದಂಥ ಬಾವುಟ ಹಾರಾಡುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಇದರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲ್ ಅಟೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ರಾಮ ನಗರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲ್ ಅಟೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—One thing that the Member must remember is that if he wants information with regard to administrative matters, he can come and meet me. If he wants anything to be admitted on the floor of the House, if he says there is anything, I will look into it. If he does not choose to ascertain what has happened to it, he cannot expect me to carry in my mind information relating to everything with regard to him and with regard to all the Members. Why does he not come and meet me ? Instead of that, he gets up on the floor of the House and asks what has happened to the motion which he has sent. He knows that it has been rejected. He gave notice of 2½ hours discussion. It is being processed. Is it humanly possible to remember all that ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ನೀವು ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಯಿತು. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟವನು ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹಾಗೆ ಆಯಿತು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The procedure followed in the Revenue Department is somewhat different from the procedure followed here. He must follow the procedure that is prescribed here. I am trying to help him. If he thinks that by asking like this, he is helping himself, he is perfectly at liberty to do so.

MOTION

Re : the Statevide Satyagraha in the Mysore State against the setting up of One Man Commission regarding the Mysore-Maharashtra Border.

Debate continued.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I called upon the Hon'ble Member Sri Sunthankar to resume his speech, I would like to know how long we are going to discuss this subject. A large number of members have come and told me that they are anxious to participate in the debate. We have already spent two days over it. One thing is certain. There is no co-ordination. Despite my efforts, whips do not meet as if there is prohibition from somebody. They must meet and find out and they must tell the Business Advisory Committee. The time allotted by the Business Advisory Committee is over. I can as well close it now but

I am trying to co-ordinate the business. Why should the burden fall on me alone? I cannot understand it.

†**Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA** (Chief Minister).—You can give the Hon'ble Members any amount of time. I have no objection for that. But let me know, when it closes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is going to impinge on other work.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Members wanted two days and two days are over. I think less than half a dozen speakers have spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may resume his speech. I cannot give him as much time as he asks. I would suggest such of the members who have common views may co-ordinate among themselves. I would give chance to one more member. If everybody wants chance to speak on this matter, I do not know how to find time. Members were watching the debate and they were saying that no time limit should be fixed. All-right, no time limit is fixed. Now the member may please try to be brief.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—When we rose on Saturday, I was referring to the point of the failure of the Central Government and the Central leadership to evolve a national policy in the matter of reorganisation of States. They treated the reorganisation matter as a party issue and dealt with it on a party level. They failed to rise above party considerations. They looked only to their party interest. They looked only how the reorganisation will suit their power politics and how the Congress Party would retain power. With that sole objective, they treated the matter of States Reorganisation. While doing that, as I have already said, they bungled in a variety of ways and particularly they bungled on the question of Bombay City. There was a conspiracy in Indian politics against Maharashtra so that Maharashtra should not get the City of Bombay. A number of alternatives were proposed so that Maharashtra may not get the City of Bombay. There was the balanced be-lingual Bombay, there was the three-State-formula, there was that bigger Bi-lingual State. All these proposals tried to wrest away Bombay from Maharashtra. Sir, the Central leadership was fumbling on the issue of Bombay City. In the former Bombay State a plot was hatched by the businessmen and capitalists to wean away Bombay city from Maharashtra and the Karnataka MLAs—the Jattis and Dodmetis—all of them joined in that clique and in that conspiracy, they got as reward the bribe of Belgaum, Nippani and Karwar.

[MR. CHAIRMAN (SRI MANJAYYA SETTY) in the Chair.]

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—So they bribed?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes. It it is an open secret.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—This is a very serious matter which has got to be probed into, Sir.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Yes, it is a serious matter and that is how these border areas were included in the Mysore State.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—Whether he is going to substantiate the charges before a commission, I want to know. This is a serious matter. Is he going to tender evidence ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am not yielding, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Order, order.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I have already said, I am not yielding, Sir. The Maharashtra people resisted with all their might this conspiracy; they took up the challenge. A gigantic movement was launched for the formation of a separate Maharashtra with Bombay as capital. The Congress was routed . . .

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Davanagere).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. I want to know whether it is within the scope of the Hon'ble Member to make a submission saying that we have bribed and taken Belgaum and whether he is prepared to substantiate it and whether it is permissible to say so. Who has bribed is a matter for serious consideration.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I raised this point even earlier than Mr. Ganji Veerappa, Sir.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I raised a point of order to the effect that the Hon'ble Member Sri Sunthankar was saying that out of a conspiracy and bribing we have got Belgaum.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum).—What Mr. Sunthankar said was that they got it as a bribe.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They say they did not say it. If a word is used in haste or inaptly, why should we cling to it ? When I was hearing all that was happening, I did not want to lose the very interesting portion of the debate. Therefore I hurried back to my seat.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ್ (ಶಿರಹಟ್ಟಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂತಣಕರ್‌ರವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಶ್ರೀ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿಯವರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿಯನ್ನು ಲಂಚದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I said I was hearing. I did not want to lose a portion of the debate which was interesting. That is why I am rushing to my seat.

Sri Sunthankar is referring to Bombay, bilingual Bombay and exclusion of Bombay—how is it all relevant ? The various grievances that were in flicted upon Maharashtra—how are we concerned with them here ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Government of India, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—And that is no concern of this House. If the member goes on spending time like this, I cannot help him. He is referring to bi-lingual Bombay, and Maharashtra State—I do not see where and how they are relevant to our debate here ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—All these are relevant so far as the border issue is concerned, Sir, because why Belgaum and these areas have been put in Mysore, reasons are to be given. Because the bi-lingual State of Bombay was becoming very much bigger, some portions had to be cut down and jointed here. That is the reason.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly let me know what time is required. Or else I will try to apply the rules. I was trying to accommodate as mush as possible.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I may require one Hour, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then it will not be in this debate. It will have to be in some other debate.

Then what time does Sri V. S. Patil require ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—At the beginning of this debate I have requested to spare me at least two hours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If I have time, I will give you 2½ hours ! Unless Members come to some sort of an agreed formula, I will have to apply the rules.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—In this House there are only two sides.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—No no.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So far as this debate is concerned, the Samithi is on one side and all the other members are on the other side.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—No no.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. They are entitled to say what they feel. I do not understand how I can give so much time to Sri Sunthankar and Sri V. S. Patil. If any member wants a chance, he must be more reasonable. Otherwise, he may be blaming me.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, after all there are three sides or groups and the time may be divided among the three groups. That means we will take one day. Those who speak about Maharashtra-Mysore Border, constitute two groups and the other group speaking about Kasargod. There is no question of Party affiliation at all. It is affecting all parties. You will see Sir, the PSP is with us. But the head of the PSP and the head of the SSP are with us. Bur in this House these parties are joining the Congress on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know what kind of head there is without the trunk ! Let us come to some understanding. You do not expect the Speaker to go to everybody. Unless Members agree, I have to deny some rights to some members.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I will finish as early as possible, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may continue for some time. Let somebody try and come to some understanding and tell me about it. Otherwise, it becomes difficult for me.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, the issue of Bombay is quite relevant with the border issue, because this rose out of the issue of the Bombay City and that is why I have been referring to it. As regards Bombay, there was a gigantic agitation in Maharashtra and when the Congress was routed in 1957 election in Western Maharashtra,

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

the Congress High Command was alarmed and in order to save *their* own party in Maharashtra, they had to yield the demand of the Maharastrians and they created the separate Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital. But, Sir, what about the border areas which were linked up with Bombay ? Unfortunately, they have remained in Mysore. The question of Bombay was solved, but this question of border is yet to be solved. Now, Sir, these border areas have been made a bone of contention between the two States of Mysore and Maharashtra. That was another blunder of the Centre. As I have already said, the Centre has thrown the grains before these two cocks and the two States are fighting like among themselves. Sir, they are fighting with whatever weapons they can fight with and they are fighting without an end. It has been an endless fight for the last eight years. I agree with Sri Kadidal Manjappa that there must be a finality to this issue and that is why this border issue must be settled once for all. It is no use saying that the issue is closed and should not be re-opened. Similarly, it is no use saying as Hon'ble Member Sri Kadidal Manjappa said that the issue is a trivial one. I do not understand how an Hon'ble Member like Kadidal Manjappa can say that the issue is trivial. When the lives of a million people, fate of a million people living in these border areas is concerned, how can he say that it is trivial ? Similarly, I fail to understand the logic in his argument that if the issue is re-opened, the country would be torn to pieces. How, Sir, is the re-opening of an issue will tear out the country into pieces—I fail to comprehend. Is the country so brittle and so weak that it will be torn to pieces ? Heavens are not going to fall if Marathi areas of Mysore are going to be transferred to Maharashtra. This has been a festering wound in our body politic. It has to be removed for the healthy growth of the nation.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Have the whole of India ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I would request the Hon'ble Member Kadidal Manjappa to consider that realities have to be faced and faced boldly. It is no use evading the realities. It is no use evading them and avoiding them or closing one's eyes to the realities of the situation. Sir, Hon'ble Member Sri Kadidal Manjappa's speech was a veiled attack on growing communalism in the State. I would like to tell him that by keeping such issues pending, is to give fresh phillip to the rancour of communalism in the State, because as he already stated communalism is working under the garb of linguism; communalism is taking the cover of linguism. If you have to stop it, if you have to prevent it, this border issue which is made a pretext for communalism in the State will have to be finally settled.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Which State ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This State. He was referring to this State and not Maharashtra. Sir, the re-organisation was as a matter of fact, the responsibility of the Centre. It was the duty of the Centre to settle all the issues arising out of re-organisation. This border issue is one of such issues. It is the obligation of the Centre to settle this issue. But the Centre has been throughout evading to settle this issue, evading to fulfil...

Mr. SPEAKER.—These aspects have to be made out in the Parliament. Pointing out mistake of the Centre at the Parliament is proper. But here...

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—These are pertaining to the border areas. They have left it to the States to quarrel among themselves. This has been the great blunder of the Centre. For the failure of the Centre and the States, we poor border people have to suffer. We the border people are suffering between the fight of the two States. Nobody cares what the border people wish or what they desire or what they feel and what are their intense desires and what are their aspirations. Nobody cares for the border people. We have been made helpless prey in the fight and we are the pawns between these two States. As a matter of fact, the Centre should have directly...

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a quarrel between the two States if what we hear is correct—then why blame the Centre ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—In this border issue, as a matter of fact, we are directly concerned with the Central Government. The Central Government must look to us, must decide the issue. Instead the Central Government are placing us, the border people, poor border people at the mercy of these two States. We are reduced to the status of beasts of prey. We must come out of this pitiable lot. The Centre has to share its own responsibility, which it has so far shelved still worse is the failure of the State Government. The State Government and its leadership have still more bungled in the matter of border areas. Sir, I would refer to the assurance of the Government which was held out in the first address of the Governor after the new State came into being, the new State of Mysore. In the first Address on the 19th December 1956, it is said, Sir—I would like to read the relevant portion. "Our happiness at the formation of the new State cannot make us forget that many of our brothers in Kasargod...are longing to join us. It is unfortunate that this adjustment could not be achieved before the States Re-organisation...My Government will continue to press for these minor adjustments...and hope that these...grievances will be redressed...through the Zonal Councils." Sir, that is a clear assurance held out by this Government in this Governor's Address. Then, Sir, during the debate on the Motion of Thanks to that Address, the Chief Minister Hon. Nijalingappa on 24th December 1956 said :

2-30 P.M.

> "I must also admit at the same time that there are areas, small areas no doubt, where the majority of the people speaking language different from Kannada. I for one would not hesitate to have those areas included in the respective linguistic States".

(SRI B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

Further he said "it would be necessary" ; mark these words, Sir. These are the words of the Hon. Chief Minister of Mysore. Again, Sir, about the Kannada areas in the neighbouring States, he said :

> "I take this opportunity to inform the House that to bring these areas into the New State of Mysore I am corresponding with the various Chief Ministers".

Sir, I would like to know from the Chief Minister and this Government whether they have done so far anything to bring all these Kannada areas with Mysore. I would like to know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether the issue of these Kannada areas in Kerala, Kannada areas in Madras and Kannada areas in Andhra has been raised with the South Zonal Council ? Sir, the Maharastra Government is prepared to part and transfer Kannad areas in South Sholapur, Akkalkot and Jattu taluks in Sholapur District and Kannad areas in Gadhiglaj, Shirol and Halkanagle taluks of Kohapur District.

(Interruption by Sri S. Gopala Gowda)

Sir, my hon. friend Sri Gopala Gowda does not even know that these areas are Kannada areas. Maharastra Government is prepared at this moment. But this Mysore Government and this Chief Minister Sri Nijalingappa are not willing to take them because he will have to give away Belgaum and Karwar.

Sri A. J. DODDAMETI (Ron).—No, no.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.— The hon. member does not know where these areas are. The Maharastra Government has prepared maps and statistics of these areas. The hon. Chief Minister has been giving empty assurance to the people of Kasargod but he is doing nothing. He has not been implementing those assurances. This has been the betrayal of the Kannada people in the neighbouring States.

Sir, now I come to the agitation in Mysore. Too much is being made of this agitation. The resolution says that it was spontaneous. But, no Sir ; I differ. It was not a spontaneous agitation ; it was a cooked up, stage managed Government sponsored and carried with the active assistance of the Government. It was carried out with the help of the police and the Government authorities. Police were not merely silent spectators but they were actively assisting the agitation. It was a farce of Satyagraha. I call that satyagraha as a misnomer, a mockery. Sir, resignations were another such farce. The District Congress Committees demanded the resignations from the M.L.As. and the M.L.Cs. and they had to submit their resignations to the District Congress Committees ; otherwise, they would not get their ticket for the ensuing General Elections.

Sri B. V. MAGAVI (Haveri).—I raise a point of order. I do not know how Sri Suntankar calls our satyagraha a farce ; Is it because it lacked goondaism in it ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, what happened in Gulbarga, Davangere and Harihar railway stations? At Gulbarga the passengers had to flee away from the train and the passenger train went empty came to Sholapur.

(*Interruption by Sri B. V. Magavi and Sri N. O. Samji*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. If one or two try to help him a dozen others begin to do so and my position becomes very difficult.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, the behaviour of the police in this agitation was wonderful. They were allowing all sorts of irregular and illegal things to happen. Railway stations were taken possession of by the mob. People were riding on railway engines hoisting Congress flags and shouting slogans. Tables were placed on the railway tracks and persons like Hon'ble G. V. Halliikeri were standing on the table and addressing the people gathered on the railway track. Sir, how was this being allowed? Then, Sir, truck loads of persons were brought from outside and taken from place to place and the police were allowing it. At Belgaum railway station and in the Belgaum City hundreds of persons were brought by trucks from Kannada areas like Sankeshwar, Bagewadi, Hubli, Sampagaon and other places. They had to import people from other places because they were not finding them in Belgaum. How many people were there from Belgaum I ask? Only a handful. There was absolutely no support for this agitaion in the Marathi border areas. They had to bring people from outside, import people from outside by truck loads. They were hiring them, paying them six rupees a day which was paid by the Congress Committee.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, he is using the word 'hired people'. He must be very careful in using such words.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, very exaggerated reports and even false reports of the agitation were circulated from Bangalore by the Publicity Departments. On the 14th June, absolutely there was no Hartal in Belgaum City. But, it was announced on the Radio that there was Hartal on that day. They announced that 25,000 people took part in the procession when there were hardly 2,000 to 3,000 people. Similarly, it was stated that 25,000 people were in the procession at Nippani town. As a matter of fact, the population of Nippani town is not more than 24,000.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Did you not contradict?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I did contradict it in a Press Statement. Similarly, when a handful of persons were arrested, it was stated as hundreds were arrested. At Belgaum railway station when 50 or 80 were arrested, it was stated that more than 1,200 persons were arrested. The railway track is just half a furlong from my residence and I have seen it all this with my own eyes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the hon. Member attacking the Press or the Government?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—It is the Government which has released all this false information. Similarly the punishments meted out were very mild, it was almost no punishment. The punishments were not at all deterrent. The attitude of the police and authorities with regard to this agitation can be contrasted with that regarding the agitation of Marathi people.

Sri M. R. PATIL.—Did the police award punishments or the Magistrates ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—What about the Sections? It is the police who apply the Sections. They were all very mild sections. If there were harsh sections under which they were prosecuted, members like Sri R. S. Patil would not have dared to go there. When there was satyagraha by the Marathi people, the minimum punishment was 3½ months rigorous imprisonment. The police ill-treated the satyagrahis and they were beating them. They were leaving them 25 miles away in jungles at midnights, and the sentences used to vary from 3 months to 11 months. That was how they tried to suppress the agitation. The fact is that the Chief Minister Sri Nijalingappa accepted the Working Committee decision regarding the appointment of one man commission. But he was unable to face his opponents in his own party. In order to come out of that awkward situation he wanted the agitation because on the 13th June in a press interview he clearly stated that such demonstrations were necessary to bring pressure on the High Command. So these agitations were carried on with his approval.

Sri B. V. MAGAVI (Haveri).—In which paper it is reported ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Once the agitation started with the approval of the Government, it turned out to be a boomerang against the Chief Minister Sri Nijalingappa and his leadership was made the target of this attack. One Sri Annu Guruji of Belgaum said .....

Sri A. J. DODDAMETI.—On a point of order. Can he mention the name of a person who is not here to defend ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I am not criticising any body. I am referring to his statement. He stated on the 10th June that this agitation was not against Marathi people. This was an agitation against Sri Nijalingappa and his Government. So, the hon'ble Chief Minister was the target of this agitation. Sri Nijalingappa was called upon to resign and lead the agitation. So, that was the struggle for power within the Congress party and that was the struggle between Nijalingappa group and anti Nijalingappa group in the Congress and the struggle for power broke out in the form of agitation against the one man commission. It was agitation against Nijalingappa's leadership. So, the border issue was made only a pretext for it. As the elections are approaching, his opponents in his own party wanted to make capital out of this issue.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—What about us ?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—You have also elections in your mind.

This is the significance of this agitation, as a matter of fact. Elections and power struggle within the Congress party are the reasons for the agitation. Such an agitation cannot be compared with the freedom struggle, as has been compared by the Leader of the Opposition. This cannot be such a high agitation for so small objectives.

There has been opposition to the appointment of one man commission. I fail to understand why there should be an opposition. They say that these border areas, Karwar, Belgaum, Nippani must belong to Karnataka, from historical times they belong to Karnataka. If they are so strong in their case, why are they opposed to face the one man commission ? I fail to understand that.

Sri B. V. MAGAVI.—It is because they are beyond dispute.

Sri B. R. SUNTANKAR.—It clearly shows that the Mysore's case is very weak. If their case had been strong they would have been ready to face the commission any time. I am surprised at the arguments of both the Leader—of the Opposition and Sri Gopala Gowda that the one man commission must be opposed. At the same time they are pressing that a high power commission should be set up to deal with border problems. When they agree for a high power commission why should they oppose one man commission ? I do not understand the logic. There is no reason or rhyme unless......

Sri B. V. MAGAVI.—High power commission for the formation of Vidarbha ?

Sri B. R. SUNTANKAR.—Yes, why not for bifurcating the Mysore State ? I have no objection to appointing high power commission to decide all border areas.

Sri S. V. AGNIHOTHRI (Dharwar).—On a point of order; ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order in it.

Sri B. R. SUNTANKAR.—I would not object to the appointment of a high power commission. But, I do not understand why this issue should wait for this high power commission. Let them start to find solution for the problem and first solve this border line and afterwards let them take one by one issues like Madaksira, Hosur, Talvadi, etc. Why should we be made to wait ? Let us start with the solution of our problem first. Not that we are cent per cent for this one-man commission. The one-man commission would be useless unless the terms of reference are very clear. Our position is quite clear in this matter. The terms of reference must include contiguity, village as unit, linguistic majority and wishes of the people. These principles have been adopted in the case of the borders between Madras and Andhra and Parliament by its amendment has adopted these principles. So, why should these principles be not applied to this case also ? If the border issues of all States are to be satisfactorily solved, these are the only principles which should be adopted and ultimately I hope Government will be forced to adopt them. The

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

Working Committee's resolution includes also the question of Kasargod because that commission is entrusted with the border issues between Mysore and Maharashtra and between Mysore and Kerala. My hon'ble Friend Sri Gopala Gowda who wants Kasargod to come back to Mysore is forgetting that this commission is entrusted with settling the border dispute between Mysore and Kerala also. So, I would like to appeal again to those who oppose the appointment of one-Man commission that they should take into consideration all these matters and they should press for clear terms of reference so that they may get all the Kannada areas in the neighbouring States and should be willing to part with the Marathi areas only on the basis of these principles. Even the Maharashtrians and the Maharashtra Government are not asking for this area or town or this popalation. They say that this issue should be solved on the basis of definite principles. We have been harping on that on the floor of the House time and again. To those who oppose the appointment of one-man commission, I would appeal that they should not oppose it but a shart should be made with the solution of this border issue between Maharashtra and Mysore and between Mysore and Kerala and other issues will automatically be solved. I would end with an appeal to the members of this House to take a considerate view and not be blined by fanaticism and linguism and to see reason in our arguments and in our case and try to be just to us. Sir, I have done.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

†**Sri GANJI VEERAPPA** (Davangere).—Sir, on a very important matter like this, a matter which vitally concerns the interests of not only Mysore and Maharashtra but the whole country I only wish to give very serious attention to it and not indulge ourselves in very light and irresponsible talk. In fact, I am pained to say that my hon'ble Friend Sri Sunthankar when he was speaking here, was moved more with emotion rather than with reason. In his great anxiety to criticise the satyagraha movement in Mysore, in his great anxiety to attack the very genuineness of the motive of the State Government, Sri Sunthankar was simply making sweeping remarks about satyagrahis who launched the satyagraha with a very laudable object. He went to the extent of criticising the press, the All-India Radio and the hon'ble Members of this House as well as of the other House and the Ministers who tendered resignations and went on building a big castle out of all this. I can only say that there was on seriousness in what he was speaking. There was more of emotion, irresponsible talk as I would call it. If certain areas are to go to Maharashtra, let them put forth facts and figures and convince this House. This is a matter on which there should be more of reasoning and more of sense. This is a matter which, as you all know, has been decided. The Central Government appointed a High-power Commission. We all know that they have produced a very historical report. Very high person went round the country, collected facts and

figures, heard the people, heard representations and finally made a report which is a very historical report. Let my Marathi friends have some patience. I am sure that they have no mind to stay in Mysore and they will all be routed out in the next elections. The challenge is accepted and we will see that they are defeated.

Sri B. P. KADAM (Karwar).—Yourself or your grand father cannot do that.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Let us not fight like young boys.

Sri A. P. APPANNA (Virajpet).—On a point of order, Sir. Can a member of this House refer to another member's grand father ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It is not correct to bring in others. No indecent language should be used ; that is not proper.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Will it be proper to say that we will be routed out ? He speaks as if he is referring to some school boys or cattle. We are representatives of lakhs of people. Let him have some restraint.

[MR. SPEAKER In the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—This Kind of behaviour is undesirable. I cannot possibly understand it. After all one must allo w another to speek.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The hon'ble Member says that these people are going to be ousted and thrown out, that they cannot be returned. We have got some feelings and this sort of expression rouses them. I throw a challenge to my hon'ble Eriend. If we are returned from the same area, is he going to concede us the right to join this area to Maharasthra ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are digressing from the debate.

3-00 P.M.

The Hon'ble member Sri V. S. Patil wants to throw or to accept a challenge, whichever way it might be.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—He is throwing a challenge.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I said, whichever way it might be. Somebody throws out a challenge and somebody accepts it. I question the competence of those people who throw a challenge and who accept it ? Are we making a Constitution ? Have we got the authority to do it ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Mr. Ganji Veerappa is a senior Congressman and is one of the bosses of the Party. Let him assure that if these Constituencies return these Marathi people, then they will agree that these parts should go to Maharahstra.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In this House I recognise nobody as a boss. Everybody is equal. Why should I accept anybody as boss ?

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Sir, the Hon'ble member points out his finger at us and says : " These fellows will be routed out " Is it proper ? He says this as if we are cattle to be driven out. Are we not entitled to courtesy and respect ? He should not insult us like this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow anybody to be insulted. Members have no right to insult other members in the House.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—We are thankful to you.

Sri B. V. MAGAVI.—I rise to a point of order. The Hon'ble member referred to "grandfather" and such other words. Can a member in this House refer to father and grandfather of other members ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—We must understand it with a little humour. Grandfather does not mean A's father's father or A's mother's father. Absolutely not. Why Should be taken like that ?

Sri H. R. KESHAVA MURTHY (Gandasi).—He said "these gentlemen and grandfathers put together". Can grandfathers be put together with gentlemen ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It looks as through the House is not serious.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I appeal to these members that so far as this issue is concerned, let there be some seriousness. I am glad that he came to the real issus by saying that let this matter be decided in the General Elections. Well, the people are there in the border areas. Now they have known the pros and cons of the entire situation and I am sure the people will give their verdict and our friends will know their place when they go to the electorate in the General Elections.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

I am reminded here of the speech of Sri Kadidal Manjappa the other day. He was sincerely feeling for the attitude of the people in our country. We are speaking of borders. There is only one border, namely the border of our country between China and India or between Pakistan and India. Let us all fight for that border of our country. the border is not between Maharashtra and Mysore. Instead of fighting for the border of our country, we are fighting amongst ourselves. We are fighting amongst ourselves here when there is a great danger to the borders of our country from the Chienese and the Pakistani people. Our Maharashtra friends here are fighting for the border of the State, but if you look to the proceeding of Parliament on the S. R. Bill, in fact, all these claims of Maharashtra for Nipani, Karwar and Belgaum and other areas were discussed in the form of amendments an all the amendments were thrown out and then the S.R. Act was passed and the States have been reorganised and they have been functioning constitutionally ever since 1956. But my friend Sri Sunthankar was referring in his speech that the matter is still open, the matter is still alive. I want to ask what is open and what is alive ? If you look at the correspondence between the Government of Mysore and the Government of Maharashtra after the passing of the S. R. Act in Parliament, what is contemplated is only small minor adjustments on the border of a few villages here and there and but for that the whole matter is settled. But to say that the whole matter is kept open or alive or the Belgaum issue is kept open, is not correct. What was contemplated was only minor adjustments here and there. What are these minor adjustments? They are only about a few villages here and there. If a certain village is predominantly Kannada-speaking, then it could be transferred to Karnataka and if a certain village is predominantly Marathi-speaking, then if the people so wish that village could be transferred to Maharashtra. Such minor adjustments only were contemplated by the State Government in Correspondence and we are prepared for such minor adjustment. But now to say that even after the passing of the S. R. Act by Parliament and the formation of these States, the entire issue is to be reopened is not correct.

Our friends make a claim for Belgaum. If only our friends are reasonable enough to study the history of Belgaum for the last several centuries, Belgaum District was under the rule of Kannada Kings. History tells us that formely Chalukyas and Rashtrakutas ruled over this area. Later on they were conquered and Hyder Ali occupied the area in 1776. In 1818 the entire country passed on to the British. It will also be found that formerly Belgaum was in Bellary District. Our friends should know that the present Belgaum District aws a part of the former Bellary District which later on came to us. Later on, Bellary was divided into two parts, northern and southern. The southern part became Dharwar and the Northern part became Belgaum. This is the history of Belgaum District. It was in 1836 that this division took place.

As regards the language which was predominantly spoken in this district, I only refer to the Imperial Gazetteer of India for Bombay Presidency, Vol. 2 where they have traced the history of Belgaum District.

Now with regard to the language in use in the South, West and the greater part of the District is concerned, Kannada is 65 per cent and Marathi is 25 per cent.

With regard to Belgaum Town, according to the Census of 1951, the Marathi-speaking population was 2,33,000 males, 2,25,000 and odd females; and the people speaking Kannada in Belgaum was: Males 5,67,000 and females- 5,47,000; So, the population is in the proportion of 1:2.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—I want Taluk precentage and Town percentage.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, If only you are pleased to give me more time, I am not afraid of furnishing any figures the Hon. Member wants. I can give statistics even villagewise but it takes a lot of time. Let them not think that if I give those figures, it will go against me. Not at all. I have got all the information together. Let them not for a moment think that if they are given, they can advance some argument in their favour.

This Belgaum District has a history of centuries. Four thousand years, it was under the Kannada rulers and later it became part of Bellary District; then it became part of Dharwar District.

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

Let me now turn to Belgaum City, an urban area. These urban areas, specially commercial places will have floating population; people from outside come and settle there if an urban place takes the shape of a cosmopolitan city. In fact, that is the case with all the cities in India if we go into the history of urban areas. In fact, in Bangalore alone we cannot say Kannadiga people are in a marjority. In fact, I think it is the Tamilians that are in majority; in that case, perhaps Madras may have a better claim for Bangalore. But, better sense has prevailed and Madars has not claimed it. In fact, Bombay consists of a large number of Kannada-speaking people, if you compare with the rest of the languages there. For that matter, Marathi schools are not in predominent number in Bombay City. Hence, I am sure that Maharashtra's claim for Bombay was not justifiable. In fact it was wrong on the part of the Central Government to have conceded Bombay City to Maharashtra. The Gujarath people were terrorised and the Cantral Government was forced to transfer Bombay to Maharashtra.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Point of Order, Sir, Does Bombay come under the purview of the one man Commission under contemplation? Can it come anywhere in this discussion? How is it relevant?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I may tell the Maharashtra people that the tactics they played in Gujarath will not pay here in Mysore. If the same tactics are adopted here by them, the people of Mysore will pay them with the same tactics. Let us hope and pray that good reason and good sense will prevail with them. Even as early as 1920, Sri N. C. Kelkar, the leader of Maharashtra, for whom all of them have great regard and respect, has, in fact, said that Belgaum is part of Karnataka. I will just read the other portion, which runs as follows:

> "We agree to the view stated in the resolution as now passed that while the Kanarese language being the language of the majority in the district must be given its proper place in the public affairs of the district, the Marathi language on the other hand must be given the recognition, the latitude and facilities which are due to it as the language of the *substantial minority*.
>
> "We further maintain that both these are dependent upon the recognition of the Belgaum District being a part of the Karnatak Province culturally and linguistically"

Though Maharastrians stood in substantial minority, he said that Marathi must be given due recognition, although Kannada was the predominent language in Belgaum. We have not created this document. Their own leaders have admitted this. Mahatma Gandhi, the revered leader of the Nation, when questioned as to where the open session of the Indian National Congress should take place, said that Belgaum was in Karnataka and, therefore, decided that Belgaum was the proper place to hold it,. So, the fact that Belgaum is a part of Karnatak has been recognised ever since. In fact, it has been the chief Town of Karnataka, and the centre of our culture. That being so, how can Maharashtra lay claim to it ? Because the Marathi-speaking people were the ruling class in the former Bomay State, due to their influence a number of Marathi-speaking people came to Belgaum. In fact, in a place like Ranibennur, which is near my place, merchants keep accounts in Marathi language because the income-tax an sales tax officers are Marathi people. It is just to facilitate their checking, accounts are maintained in Marathi ; for the sake of convenience, they are kept in Marathi ; that is all. In, very recent times, people from Maharashtra, the Marathi-speaking officers who retired from service, came and settled in Belgaum because the Government then in Bombay was run by Maharashtrians. So, the population of the Marathi people went on increasing. I am quoting the Census figures compiled by their own officers and by the previous State Government there. When that is so, when the predominant people who are speaking the language are only Kannada-speaking people, and when the history of the Belgaum District is nothing but Karnataka, where is any claim for our friends to say that Belgaum should be part of Maharashtra. They have resorted to this tactics because they want to take Goa. On a previous occasion this House has considered the Goa issue in great detail. As I have already mentioned, Goa was under the rule of Kannadigas for centuries. Now, they want to have Goa, because Belgaum is a convenient part that connects Goa and Maharashtra. With the ulterior aim of taking Goa, these people claim Belgaum as theirs.

Sri L. B. BIRJE (Khanapur).—Marathi.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I was only too pained to hear the speech of my friend Sri Sunthankar on this occasion. Sri Sunthankar is a balance-minded man. He lost his balance of mind in this House only while speaking about the border agitation. I have never seen him losing his balance of mind.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Point of Order, Sir. Would the Chair have allowed Sri Sunthankar to speak if he was speaking with an imbalanced mind ? He should not have used the word 'imbalanced.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I know that word is parliamentary.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Then you have lost your balance of mind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No conversation, please. He will address the Chair.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sri Sunthankar had the courage to say that the entire-movement of Satyagraha in Mysore was a ferce, and that it was a Government-backed movement and Police-backed movement. He was even criticising the Courts and the Judiciary that gave punishments. If the limit of expression of ideas or having a claim for certain parts goes to this length, am I not justified in saying that there is no balance in this ? There were loss of lives in Davangere and Harihar. People did not make a joke to offer Satyagraha.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It is a protest against the appointment of one-man Commission!

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Is it correct to call this a Drama and farce? Is it a responsible way of tackling a problem? I was in Bombay when the A. I. C. C. meeting took place. Sri Senapathy Bapat offered Satyagraha in front of the Chief Minister's residence. If the Satyagraha in Mysore can be said as farce, we could say that the Satyagraha in Bombay, where the Chief Minister took them home and offered them food and juice, was a State managed thing. In Mysore it was a spontaneous movement of the people who went to Jail without any sort of incitement. Could that be called a farce or a Drama?. There is a limit to say, to criticise and making unfair attacks. So, it is unfairness on the part of those who held out threats so far as the Satyagraha in Mysore is concerned. We cannot tolerate such a talk as this.

Coming to the other question of Kerala, the Prime Minister during her visit to Kerala made a statement that till the popular Government is established in Kerala, this question of the border with Mysore and Kerala cannot be taken up. That is a reasonable analysis of the situation and the Prime Minister was right in saying that the popular Government in Kerala should be consulted on this. Now the whole question is with regard to the appointment of one-man Commission. Here, people have opposed the appointment of one-man Commission only for this reason. If this Commission is intended for reopening of the settled questions like Belgaum, Karwar and Nippani, then the people of Mysore are opposed to such a Commission and they are right. If it is a question of small adjustments here and there as I was putting forth a few minutes back, then I can say that either the two State Governments, the two Chief Ministers can sit together and settle, or if they do not come to any agreement, some sort of arbitration may be made with a direction or reference that this one-man Commission or whoever they may be, should confine their attention only to the settlement of minor questions. Any settled problems like Belgaum or Nippani connot be reopened and Belgaum is ours. Similarly Nippani and Karwar. The Konkani people in their Conference have said that it has nothing to do with Marathi. Let us understand the position clearly. Whether we are opposed to the one-man Commission or not is now a matter for consideration. We are opposed to the appointment of the one-man Commission if this Commission is to reopen settled issues, which means issues settled under the S. R. Act. Everything is in the proceedings. If this Commission is only meant to settle minor adjustments, then we are agreeable. The State Government and the M.P.C.C. have advisedly said that unless the terms of reference are settled we cannot agree to the appointment of this one-man Commission. But, I cannot foresee as to what happens between the two Chief Ministers of States. Let us not embarrass them. When the Working Committe hopes that something will come out when the two Chief Ministers will meet, let us hope that they will come to an understanding. If these two leaders come to a settlement, there is nothing for any boundary Commission or one-man or three-men Commision.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Chief Minister of Bombay has issued a statement and it has appeared in yesterday papers that this matter did not arise in the Working Committee, and it was meant to reopen the issue. Has it not come to the notice of Sri Ganji Veerappa ?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Let us not embarrass them or let us not anticipate things.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—He is clear in his mind. If you are clear, you can protest against the proposal itself.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—The M.P.C.C. has given a clear directive. The State Government has taken a clear decision as to the stand that should be taken by the State Government. In fact, the Boundary Commission, if at all to be appointed, should be done after the entire question regarding the terms of reference to be settled is agreed upon by the two Chief Ministers. Otherwise, noting else should happen. In fact, the Prime Minister's statement in Kerala is clear that unless the popular Government comes into existence in Kerala–that is logically after the general elections–the question cannot be taken up, and I read from the papers the letter written by the Governor of Kerala, who has said that he is there only as an agent of the President to carry on the day-to-day routine administration in the State and he has a mandate from the people not to have any negotiations with regard to the border issues. When that is so, how can this question be taken up till a popular Government is established in Kerala ? Naturally, as the State Government has also expressed, the entire question should be taken up after the general elections. When the entire country is preparing itself for the general elections, in the interest of our friends, because they have to prepare themselves to fight and come up in the general elections, if really people there are convinced let us see what happens. Anyway this matter should wait till the general elections. Our Chief Minister has agred that after general elections the matter may be considered or thought of. So, I earnestly appeal to my friends here that this matter cannot be taken at this juncture, specially when the international situation is really threatening us and our international borders are not safe. In fact, our Defence Minister, hailing from Maharashtra should look to the international borders rather than considering our border problems. Our border problems can be settled among ourselves. I congratulate the Andhra and Madras States, because though there were disputes between us, they have bowed down their heads to the S. R. Act.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The Madras and Andhra Governments are not the losers by the S. R. Act. Should we be grateful to them for not yielding ? Why do you give them compliments ?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I may inform my friend not to worry ourselves now, whoever be the loser. It is true that we will be the losers. I agree with him when I say that we have respected the S. R. Act in spite of the fact that we have lost tracks of our own areas. It is a lesson for our friends to learn from us. It is not opportune either for our own State or for the State of Maharashtra to take up this question and I appeal to the Centre also not to proceed with this when great

(SRI GANJI VEERAPPA)

problems are facing the country, specially, the international problem. The economic conditions of the country are not really very happy. Therefore, it is not correct for the Centre to take up this question. Let them wait till the general elections are over. Let the Chief Ministers of both the States settle the terms of reference. It is my firm conviction that this problem if it is taken up now will not serve the interests of the country. So, I appeal to my friends here, to advice the Maharastra Government if they have got any pull over it that the question need not be taken up now. I only appeal to them to read the history of Belgaum, about the language position and the cultural ties and then let them weigh whether they are justified in making any claim for some of these parts that are in Mysore.

3-30 P. M.

So far as the appointment of One Man's Commission is concerned, it is my opinion that unless the terms of reference are settled and agreed upon, the Centre should not proceed to appoint the One Man Commission. It is my opinion that inspite of One Man's Commission, let there be Three Men Commission consisting of high power Judges of Supreme Court. If really the terms of reference are agreed upon, it will be minor adjustments. That is the position. It is not that we welcome the appointment of One Man's Commission When we say that it may be appointed it is only for the restricted purposes and not for general purposes. I want to make it very clear to my friends in this say. I only request my friends Sri G. V. Gowda and others to look into two booklets published by the State Government and also a report published in the news papers of the decision of the State Government. They have explicitly made clear what the decision was. Mr. Sunthankar says that the matter is kept alive. If the border question is opened here, every state will raise its border problems. We have heard that there is already an agitatation for Vidharba State. Therefore, the entire security of the country will be at stake. So let us not touch upon the dangerous problems of border disputes. When once we get into these problems there will be no end for them. Let us think that the border problems are between China and India and between Pakistan and India. There are lakhs and lakhs of Kannada people in Akkalkote and Sholapur. These Kannadigas have adjusted themselves in these areas. They are co-operating with the Maharastrians there. Why the same attitude should not be here with our friends. Let them search their hearts about the treatment given by the Mysore Government. Developmental works have been sanctioned and water supply scheme for Belgaum City at a cost of lakhs and lakhs of rupees has been given. The State Government has recommended for the starting of aluminium Factory in Belgaum and an industrial estate is already there. There is no discrimination in treatment in all parts of the State. The same treatment is not given to the Kannada parts of the

Maharastra State. My friends instead of telling the Maharastra Government to treat the Kannadigas better, they say Belgaum should go there. Sri Sunthankar did not make any reference about the inferior treatment for the Kannadigas there. Inspite of their attitude here, we will gladly have them with us because they have got better administration, better facilities and better status here-in Mysore. We receive them here as members of the Legislative Assembly. They speak in Marathi which many of us do not understand even thought they know Kannada. We are prepared to have Marathi Reporter to report their speeches in this House. We have got so much of telerance. When I was in Poona as Student people knowing Kannada did not want to speak in Kannada. They persisted to speak in Marathi. This is how they treat us. It is better in your own interest to remain in Mysore, and it is better that all our attention is conentrated on national problems which really affect the national solidarity. With these few words I appeal to the Members to take a unanimous decision and urge the Centre to take up this question after the general election and to confine to the S.R. Act and not to give scope for re-opening the settled issues.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ್ ನಾಮೋಷಿ (ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, one man Commission ಗೆ ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಹಾರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹದಗೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋದಾಗ ರೂಪಾಯಿನ ಅಪಮೌಲ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇತ್ತೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಧೋರಣೆ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಜನರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಬೇಡಿದರೆ ಅವರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ತಿರುಗಿಸಿ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಉದ್ಬವಿಸಿ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ವೈಮನಸ್ಸು ಉಂಟು ಮಾಡುವುದು. ನಿಮಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ 80 ಪೈಸೇಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆ. ಜಿ. ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್‌ಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ 1 ರೂಪಾಯಿ 40 ಪೈಸೇಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕೆ. ಜಿ. ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಶೋಲಾಪುರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ 2½ ರಪಾಯಿ, ಪೂನಾ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಗೆ, ಹೋದರೆ 4 ರೂಪಾಯಿ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರನ್ನು ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಕೊಡಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಬೀರಿ ಈರೀತಿ ವೈಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಯಾರು ? ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಂಡಲಿಗಳು, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಕೊಡಿರಿ ಎಂದರೂ ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಜೋಳ ಕೊಡಿರಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಎನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರೀ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಗುಜರಾತ್ ಜೊತೆಗೂ ಇದೆ. ಇದೇ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಗುಜರಾತ್ ಭಾಗ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸ್ವಭಾವ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲ ಜಗತ್ತಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಯಾರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದು. ಅವರು ಆಗಲಿ, ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೇರಳದ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಡಿಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗುವುದು ನಿಜ. ನಮಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಕೇಳಿ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ವನ್ ಮ್ಯಾನ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೂ, ಆಗಲೇ ಕೇರಳದ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗಂಡ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಇಬ್ಬರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ಯಾವುದೇ ಮಂತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ ಲಗ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಕೇರಳದ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಆ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೋರಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈಗ ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್, ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗ ಮುಂದೆ ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹಿಂದು ಮುಂದು ನೋಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ್ ನಾಮೋಷಿ)

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿವಾಜಿನಗರ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಶಿವಾಜಿನಗರ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಈರೀತಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎದ್ದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ! ನಾನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ದೂರುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1-7-1966ಕ್ಕೆ ಬುಕೆಲೆಟ್ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ "ರೀ ಓಪನಿಂಗ್ ನಾಟ್ ಫೀಜಿಬಲ್" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದೇ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು? ಮೊದಲು ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಹಳ್ಳಿಕೇರಿ ಗುದ್ದಲಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಲಗಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಬ್ಲಿಟ್ಸ್‌ನೊಳಗೆ ಬರೆದುಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಇದಾದ ಮೇಲೂ ಕೂಡ, ಮತ್ತೆ ಇದೇ ತಿಂಗಳು 5ನೇ ತಾರೀಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಲ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ವನ್ ಮ್ಯಾನ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಟರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ರೆಫರೇನ್ಸ್‌ಸ್ ನೋಡೋಣ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಏನು ಇತ್ತು? ಇವೊತ್ತು ಬೆಳಗಾಮ್ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏನು, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏನು? 10 ವರ್ಷ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಏನೂ ಫಾಸಿ ಕೊಡಲಲ್ಲ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಗುಲಾಮರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಂತೆ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಹಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಲಿಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್ ಹೋಮ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಇದೆ. ಗುಲಾಮಗಿರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. They are thinking that they are at our mercy. We are not thinking so. But we are giving them equal treatment. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಅಭಿನಂದನೆ ಅರ್ಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ಅಭಿನಂದನೆ ಅರ್ಪಿಸುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷ ಒಂದು ದಾಂಧಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಾವು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಣೆಗಾರರೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ ಅವರು ಮೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಹಾಳು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರೆ? ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ತಪ್ಪು ಕೆಲಸದಿಂದ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಗೂಂಡಾಗಿರಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಆರೀತಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅಂಥ ತಪ್ಪು ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಯಾರು! ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಖಂಡಿತ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಸಿ. ಸಿ. ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ನಡೆದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರೇಂದ್ರ ಪಾಟೀಲರು ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟರು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಜನರು ಅವರು ಗೂಂಡಾ ಎಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಗ್ರೂಪ್‌ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಸಿ. ಸಿ. ಅಂಥೋಳನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎಂ. ಪಿ. ಸಿ. ಸಿ. ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಮ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರೇ ರೆಸೆಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ದಾವಣಗೆರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಡೆಮಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡು ಹಾರಿಸಿ ಯು. ಪಿ. ಯಿಂದ ಒದಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬ ತರುಣನ ಕೊಲೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಅವರದು ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸೋಷಿಯಾಲಿಸಮ್ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಿನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಗುಂಡು ಹಾರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ! ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಈಗ ಇರುವ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿಗೂ ಏನು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಇದೆ?

Mr SPEAKER.—The subject matter of resolution is very wide. If members go into the question of democracy and socialism and socialistic pattern of society, how is it connected with border dispute and border agitation?

Sri GANGADHAR NAMOSHI.—Constitutionally we have got a right.

Mr SPEAKER.—They may Condemn the Government on ten thousand grounds which are very good and very important elsewhere.

But in a discussion on the border agitation, that alone is the important matter. Are we concerned with lack of food in the border situation ? I have no objection if that is also brought in. But time will be consumed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ್ ನಾಮೋಷಿ.—ಇದು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯ. ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಶಾಂತರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಡೆಮಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ, ಹರಿತಾಳ ಮಾಡಿ ಸೊಂಪು ಮಾಡಿ, ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು ? ಈ ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ಇಷ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರು ಡೆಮಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅಂತಹವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುಂಡು ಹಾರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಬಂದ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರು ದಿವಸ ಮೊದಲು 150 ಜನರನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಒಳಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದಿರಿ.

ನಾವು ಬೇರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ? ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು ? ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಕ್ಕಿದ್ದಹಾಗೆಯೇ 144ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಹಾಕಿದರು. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಬಂದ್ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ 150 ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಬಂಧನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟರು. ದಾವಣಗೆರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎ. ಐ. ಸಿ. ಸಿ. ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆದಾಗ ದಾವಣಗೆರೆಯ ಜನರು ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ 144ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಶ್ರೀ ಹನುಮಂತರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರನ್ನು ಒಯ್ದು ಲಾಕಪ್ಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟರು. ಅವರನ್ನು ಲಾಕಪ್ಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟಾಗ ಅವರ ಬಟ್ಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶಾಂತಿಯುತವಾದ ಚಳುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಗುಂಡು ಹಾರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂತಹ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ತುಳಿದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಗಡಿಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಹೈ ಪವರ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಅನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಆದ ನಂತರ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಸತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಎರಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಲಾಭವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪತ್ರಿಕಗಳವರು ಶ್ರೀ ಮೊರಾರ್ಜಿ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ "Why this commission should be appointed before the election". ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು Why ask me ? Ask those who appoint the Commission." ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶಾಂತ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಚಳುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು, ಸೊಲ್ಲಾಪುರ ಮುಂತಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ನಿಜವಾದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯಿರಿ, ಡಿ. ಐ. ಆರ್ ಅನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಚೀನೀಯರು ಮತ್ತು ಪಾಕೀಸ್ಥಾನದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರು ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸುಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಈ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆಯೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸುಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕರ್ನಾಕಟದ ಜನರು ಶೂರರು. ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಗೆಲ್ಲುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ಕೆಲವು ಹೋಗಬಹುದು, ಹೋದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಹೈ ಪವರ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ಹೈ ಪವರ ಕಮಿಷನಿನವರು ಬರೀ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಒಂದೇ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಆಂಧ್ರ—ಮೈಸೂರು, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್—ಮೈಸೂರು, ಮೈಸೂರು—ಕೇರಳ ಮತ್ತು ಗುಜರಾತ್—ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಗಳಿಗೂ ಇರುವ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟಾರೆ ಬಗೆ ಹರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥಾ ಸಮಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅದನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಗಡಿಯ ಪಶ್ನೆ ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾಳೆ ಆಂಧ್ರ—ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಗಡಿಯ ಪಶ್ನೆಯ ಕಡೆಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ತಿರುಗಿಸಬಾರದು. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಒಂದು ಠರಾವನ್ನು ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಠರಾವಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು ನಮಗೆ ಬರಲು ನೆರವಾಗುವು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ್ ನಾಮೋಷಿ)

ದೆಂದು ಏಕಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗ ರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಾರದು ಎಂದಲ್ಲ. ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರಿಗೆ ಲಾಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯವರು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಹೈ ಪವರ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ನಂಬೂದ್ರಿಪಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣನನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The debate will go on today, It will definitely close tomorrow. It will not go beyond tomorrow. I will try to accommodate as many Members as possible. But let the Members agree among themselves. I am now going to put a time limit. Sri K. P. Gadag may take fifteen minutes only.

† **ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್ (ಗದಗ್).**—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಈವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಗೊಡವೆಗೂ ಹೋಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯ ಇದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇರುವ ಮನೆ, ನಾವು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದ ಮನೆ, ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಎರಡನೆಯವರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಗಿ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು. ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ಚಳುವಳಿ ಗೊಡವೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಚಳುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಇದ್ದದ್ದನ್ನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನೇಕ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಚಳುವಳಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದರು. ಮುಂಬೈನಲ್ಲಿ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ನಡೆಯುವ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಉಗ್ರವಾದ ಚಳುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆ ವಗೈರೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಉಪವಾಸವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡರು. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಮುಖಂಡರೂ ಮತ್ತು ವಯೋವೃದ್ಧರೂ ಆದಂತಹ ಒಬ್ಬರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಉಪವಾಸ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡಿಸಿದರು ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದರೆ, ಆ ವಯೋವೃದ್ಧರ ಉಪವಾಸದಿಂದ ಅನಾಹುತವಾಗುವ ಭಯ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಇಡೀ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದು ಅಲ್ಲೋಲ ಕಲ್ಲೋಲವನ್ನು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸಿದರು. ಭಯಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸರಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳೂ ಅದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಧ್ಯ ರಾತ್ರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 10 ಗಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಗಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಠರಾವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಒಳಗೆ ಏಕ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವಂಥಾದ್ದು ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ತರಹ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಪೂರ್ವಭಾವಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಆ ವಾದವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೆ ಅಲ್ಲ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಜಾಣತನ ಮತ್ತು ಕುಯುಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ವಾದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನ್ಯಾಯ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಅನ್ಯಾಯದ ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

4-P.M.

ಬೆಳ್ಗಾಂ, ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರವಾರ ಇವು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಆಯೋಗಗಳು ಸಾಧಕ ಬಾಧಕಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಅವರು ವರದಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಅದು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿರ್ಣಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ತೀರಾ ತಪ್ಪು ದಾರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು.

ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಸವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಕೂಡ ಅವನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸುಂತನ್‌ಕರವರು ಕೆಲವು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನಫಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾದರೂ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದೇನೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಈಗ ಬೆಳ್ಗಾಂ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎನ್. ಸಿ. ಕೇಳ್ಕರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮುಖಂಡರು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನದಲ್ಲಿ 29 ನೇ ಮೇ 1929 ರಂದು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದು ಹೀಗಿದೆ :

> '' Mention has also been made of the declaration made by the leaders of Maharashtra in 1929 when the literary conference was held in Belgaum. It is necessary to refer to a relevant portion of the declaration issued under the singatures of Sri N. C. Kelkar and four other leaders on 29th May 1929.—
>
> '' We agree to the view stated in the resolution as now passed that while the Kanarase language being the language of the majority in the district must be given its proper place in the public affairs of the district, the Marathi language on the other hand must be given the recognition, the latitude and facilities which are due to it as the language of the substantial minority.
>
> ' We further maintain that both these are dependent upon the recognition of the Belganm District being a part of the Karnatak Province culturally and linguistically. Such recognition is, in our opinion, the recognition of truism......''

ಈಗ ಎನ್. ಸಿ. ಕೇಳ್ಕರವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸುಂತಣಕರ್‌ರವರು ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ, ಈ ಬೆಳ್ಗಾಂ, ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಎಂ.ಪಿ.ಗಳು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದುದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ ಮಾತಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ ತಿಂಗಳು 1956ರನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾದಾಗ ಈ ಬೆಳ್ಗಾಂ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏಳು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟಗಳನ್ನು ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಮತಗಣನೆಯಾಗಿ ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅದು ಮತಗಣನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಕಾರವಾರ, ಸೂಪ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಗಳು ಆಗಿವೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸುಂತಣಕರ್‌ರವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ದೂರವಾದ ಮಾತುಗಳು. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಈ ತರದ ಚಳವಳಿಯ ಮೂಲವೇನೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿವೆ. ಈ ಗಡಿವಾದ ಎಂಬುದು ಮುಗಿದುಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆರೆಯುವುದು ನೆಟ್ಟಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸುಂತಣಕರ್‌ರವರು ರೀ-ಓಪನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ತೀರಾ ತಪ್ಪು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ, ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನಿನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ, ಅದು ಹೌದು, ಇದು ಹೌದು, ಕಾನ್‌ಫಿಡೆನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ ಇದೆ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ Zonal Council ರಚಿಸುವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ದಿವಂಗತ ಗೋವಿಂದ ವಲ್ಲಭಪಂತರು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್)

ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಸ್ಪದ ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

> "Explaining the scope of the Zonal Councils in this behalf, the then Home Minister late Govind Vallabh Pant said :
>
> "The Zonal Councils will meet and endeavour to resolve the disputes, because, after all, the goodwill of neighbours is of much greater value than a small patch of territory."

ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಒಂದು ಕ್ಷುಲ್ಲಕ ಮಾತಿಗೆ ಜಗಳಾಡುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ಬರೀ ಒಂದು ಅಲ್ಪತನವೇ ಸರಿ. ಮತ್ತು ನಾವು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಕೆಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ದಿವಂಗತ ಪಂತರು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಸಿ. ರಿಪೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರು ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಯಾವ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಳ್ಗಾಂ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ?

Sri N. O. SAMAJI.—(*Marathi*).

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು, ಒಂದು ಸಮ್ಮತ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು, ಇನ್ನೊಮ್ಮೆ ಎತ್ತುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಎಂದು ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅಡ್ಡದಾರಿ ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ, ಯಾವ ವಿಧಾನದಿಂದ, ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮದಿಂದ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರು ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ತರಹ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಬರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದು, ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು. ಇದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ಅದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಆಯೋಗ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು. ಇದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು. ಆಯೋಗ ನೇಮಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತ ಇರುವಂಥ ಗಡಿ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಕಲಕಿ, ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಂಥ ಉಚ್ಚಮಟ್ಟದ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದು ಎರಡನೆಯದು. ಮೂರನೆಯದು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಆಗುವರೆಗೆ ಆಯೋಗದ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವುದು, ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯದು ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದು, ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಯೋಗದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದು, ಗ್ರಹಿಕೆಯಾದೀತು, ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದೀತು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸೋಣ.

ಆಯೋಗ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿದೆ. ಆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವಂತೆ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಯೋಗ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದರೆ, ಯಾವ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಇವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ವಿಧಾನದಿಂದ, ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮದಿಂದ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರವಿದೆ. ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಕೂಡ ವಿಚಾರ ವಿನಿಮಯ ಮಾಡಿ, ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನಾವು ಪಡೆಯೋಣ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿತ್ತು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಸಂಗತಿ ಎಂದರೆ, ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಾಗಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಭಾಗಗಳು ನಮಗೆ ಬರತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಅಥವಾ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಎರಡೂ ವಿಧಾನಗಳಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಭಾಗಗಳು ಬಂದಾವು ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಶಯ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಧಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಆಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, ಆಯೋಗ ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರಿಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಟವನ್ನು

ತೋರಿಸಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಆಯೋಗ ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಎರಡನೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಎಂದರೆ, ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತ ಏನೇನು ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳಿವೆ, ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಇದು ಮಲಗಿದ್ದವನನ್ನು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದಗಳು ಚಳುವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿವೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಅಡಗಿವೆ, ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇವೆ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಎದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೂಡುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ವಿದರ್ಭದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಂಧ್ರದವರು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ಕೋಲಾರ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬಿಹಾರ ಏಳಬಹುದು, ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಏಳಬಹುದು. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಗುಜರಾತ್ ಸಹ ಏಳಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಫಜಲಾಲಿ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕವಾಯಿತು, ಈಗ ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಆಂದೋಳನವನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಎಬ್ಬಿಸಿದರೆ, ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಗೊಂದಲ, ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ದೇಶದೊಳಗೆ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಎತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು, ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎನ್ನುವ ಕಟು ಅನುಭವ ಕೆಲ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲೀ, ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಎತ್ತುವುದು ವಿವೇಕವಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಎಬ್ಬಿಸಿ ಮೈಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಜಟಿಲ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಏಳುತ್ತವೆ.

ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಆಗುವ ತನಕ ಆಯೋಗದ ನೇಮಕವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಈಗ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ಕಲುಷಿತ ವಾತಾವರಣವುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಆಗುವವರೆಗೆ ಆಯೋಗದ ನೇಮಕದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಲು ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆಂದರೆ, ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ನಾವೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೇಸು ಸ್ಟ್ರಾಂಗ್ ಇದೆ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈಗಲೇ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗಮನಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದೆಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ವೇಳೆಯಾದುದರಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ವಂದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಗಡಿ ವಿವಾದವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಏಕಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಸಲಹೆಯೇನಿದೆ ಅದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆ ವಿಷಯ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಲು ಆಯೋಗ ನೇಮಿಸಬಹುದು.

†**Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI** (Afzalpur).—Mr. Speaker Sir, the demands of reorganisation of the State are equated with the demand for the formation of linguistic states by some of those who lease their arguments purely on linguism, and this shift in emphasis has led to such border disputes. No doubt it was true that this linguistic principle was mooted first in 1920 by the Indian National Congress at its session in Nagpur. Even in 1927 the statutory commission mooted the same view. But after that when the Nehru committee was appointed in 1928 it also lent a powerful support to the linguistic set up but it also laid emphasis on the redistribution of provinces on the basis of size of population, language, geographical contiguity, economic principles and financial principles. So after independence on the recommendations of the drafting committee of the Constituent Assembly the Dhar

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

Commission was appointed for the purpose of enquiring into and reporting on the desirability or otherwise of the creation of the proposed provinces of Kerala, Maharashtra, Karnataka and assessing financial, economic, administrative and other consequences of such formation. The Dhar Commission in 1948 held that the formation of provinces exclusively or even mainly on linguistic consideration would be undesirable. So the Dhar Commission gave a lead to the principle of reorganisation of states not on purely linguistic considerations but on many other considerations. After the Dhar Commission, the J-V-P committee was constituted in December 1948 and that committee also supported the view taken by the Dhar Commission. It stated that the primary consideration should be unity, security and economic prosperity of India. On these principles the States Reorganisation Commission took the view that district as a whole should be taken as a unit and taluks if they have predominance of any language and 70 per cent of people speak particular language, they should go to the state where that language is spoken. It is therefore preposterous to think now purely on linguistic principle as is done.

4.30 P.M.

We know that the States Reorganisation Commission formulated certain principles and they took district as unit, rejecting the village as unit. It is argued that the States Reorganisation Commission committed many mistakes, as argued by Sri B. R. Sunthankar. I want to tell him that that argument of his is fallacious because all the 14 states which have been reorganised are done on the basis that district is the unit and if there is any exception to be made, then that exception is to the extent of taluks and those taluks should have 70 per cent of people speaking a particular language. Now we must remember that these commissions were not appointed by the British people. The Dhar Commission was appointed by the Constituent Assembly itself and after that S.R C. was appointed by our Government itself. How can any one say that the British gave a lead and therefore district was taken as a unit? Any departure from that principle at this time is, I think, highly objectionable. If we follow the Pataskar formula *viz.*, that village should be taken as the unit and linguistic majority and contiguity should be taken into consideration, it will give rise to many complications because all the fourteen States which are keeping quiet now on the basis that a certain accepted formula was adopted by the S.R C. will rake up so many border problems. Therefore, to say that the Pataskar formula should be made applicable to the border dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore is highly objectionable and it can never be applied. Supposing we apply that formula, what will happen? The consequence will be terrible; it will not be minor adjustments but it will lead to major re-formations of the States. They are demanding that villages or towns over 500 miles must be reorganised. Not only that, they want to go deeper to the south as far as 120 miles. Is it a minor dispute, I want to ask them. It is reorganisation of the districts themselves. This Pataskar formula which was agreed to by Madras and Andhra cannot be taken as the basis for other disputes because that formula was before the S.R.C. and before the Parliament and it was specifically rejected by them. A rejected formula has again been raised and that formula they want to be adopted in the case of Mysore and Maharashtra. If this formula is adopted, I want to know whether we can retain Kolar District because the majority of the people there are Telugu-speaking. What will happen to Bellary? Then, there are so many villages in Gulbarga where Telugu is the predominant language. According to Pataskar formula, they will all have to go to Andhra. The S.R.C. has taken a decision and basing on that decision the Parliament has passed a law. Should we rake up the same points?

As far as the constitution of the commission is concerned, I am entirely against such a commission. If one commission consisting of highly placed persons has formulated certain principles and basing on that the Parliament has passed a law, where is the necessity of another commission to go into these disputes? If by agreement any area can be exchanged, that agreement can be given effect to by an Act of Parliament and by a resolution passed by both the Houses of the Legislature. The Mysore Government constituted a four-man Committee and that committee has gone thoroughly into these questions, studied the facts and made the position very clear and it has come to the conclusion that not a single village should go to Maharashtra. On the other hand, they have said that Akkalkot and Sholapur Taluks which are in Sholapur District ought to have been treated as a district and those areas ought to have been transferred to Karnataka. In spite of what they have said, this question was not raised by anybody and therefore it was merged in Sholapur District. As I said, we are against the appointment of a commission. A commission for what? For settling a dispute which has already been settled! Suppose a judgment has been passed by a High Court on a certain dispute. Should we set up another High Court and refer the same dispute to it? Therefore, it is highly objectionable to set up a commission. Our position is that we should not yield even an inch of ground except by agreement. If any area is to be transferred, let it be transferred by agreement. If any area is to be transferred to Maharashtra, let it be by agreement and not by any third person. The Maharashtra Chief Minister the other day said that as far as the terms of reference are concerned, they want to adhere to the Pataskar formula and they do not want to budge an inch from it. In the face of it, can the appointment of such a commission fructify? Can the terms of reference be agreed to by the Chief Ministers of two States? It is a sheer waste of time. What will happen is that the two Chief Ministers will take impossible positions and they won't budge an inch from their respective stands. What will happen then? The Working Committee will evolve their solution and they would like to satisfy Maharashtra as they have done now. The mistake committed by our

Chief Minister in commiting himself to the appnintment of the commission is a great blunder. Where was the need for the appointment of such a commission? If you want to take any area from Kerala, let us talk with a popular Ministry whenever it comes into existence. Belgaum and Kasargod cannot be put on the same footing; there is a difference between the two. They have taken Kasargod on the ground of communications, administrative convenience, etc. Both the cases are not identical. The appointment of a one-man Commission and that too on the consent of our Chief Minister is very unfortunate for Mysore State. In fact, the Maharashtra Chief Minister is reported to have said that no responsible member of the Working Committee has favoured Mysore's argument. If that is the position, I do not know what will happen with regard to the terms of reference which are going to be given to the Commission which is going to be appointed. After all the Satyagraha and agitation conducted by the people of Mysore State, was this amendment sponsored by the Congress necessary? They had agitated so much against the appointment of the Commission itself and now here they welcome it. After undergoing the trouble by launching Satyagraha and showing their resentment to the appointment of the one-man Commission now they come with a resolution that the stand taken by the Government is all right and it should be supported. This is a stab on the back of those people who went to jail and launched this agitation. We are sure that there will not be any agreement on the terms of reference because the Maharashtra Government want the Pataskar formula and we do not want that formula to be applied. The Pataskar formula was only an exception and they want that exception to be made the rule in our case. So I should like to say that the appointment of this one-man Commission is not in the interest of Mysore people and the people of Mysore are against the appointment of such a Commission. If over their head such a Commission is appointed, and if any consequence prejudicial to the interests of Mysore flows from that, I do not know what will happen here.

Now our friends who have been elected from this area that on that basis their argument should be accepted for the dissection of this area. In this connection, let me state the position about Bidar District. In Bidar there are Six constituencies and out of them four went to the Congress. During the last election one candidate supported by MES succeed in the general elections and he is here. He got elected by 38 votes majority. He got only 38 votes more than the Congress candidate. There was a triangular fight. The MES got 13,424 votes, the Congress got 13,386 votes and the PSP which stands for *status quo* got 4,344 votes. Thus it will be seen that the Congress and the PSP which both stand for Karnatak between them got a majority of the votes whereas the MES got only 13,424 votes. Therefore they were in a minority. Even now we will be magnanimous and even though you have not got a majority vote still we will concede and we are prepared to sit across the table and discuss.

We will be areeable to part with some of the villages which are clearly Marathi-speaking. But what can be done only by agreement and not by appointment of any Commission. Let the hon'ble member not take shelter under the argument that because he is elected therefore he should go to Maharashtra with that part. We refute his claim because he has not got a majority.

Sri BAPURAO ANANDARAO HULSOORKER (Hulsoor).–What about Belgaum and Karwar where we have defeated the Congress and the PSP.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—This time you will not be elected The result of 1962 will be reversed.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—He is diffident about his own election.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I may be diffident about my election, but I am not diffident about Karnatak. We are very firm about it and no power on earth can separate us from those areas because the S.R.C. has already given certain decisions. If they are agreeable for the Pataskar formula to be adopted throughout India for all the 14 States, let it come, but let it not be applied only for the dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore.

Sir, we are dealing with Mysore, Maharashtra and other 14 States which have been reorganised. Hence, no exception could be made on the basis of language in respect of any State. The Punjab and Hariana are on a different footing altogether. The Maharashtrians may be agreeable for the setting up of a commission and they may say that this is a little thing. I assert that this is not a little thing. They want whole taluks to be gulped; from Belgaum, they want to go to Bidar District, then Karwar, then go down and take Goa. If their argument is taken, Konkani is a dielect of Marathi. I am sure you differ from it. The Konkani people say that Konkani is an independent language; there are authorities; Sammelans have passed resolutions that Konkani is an independent language. Then, Maharashtrians say: "No, no, Konkani is a sister language of Marathi.' Even if that is disputed, then they say, Konkani is a daughter language of Marathi and that it comes from the Sanskrit. These arguments, I do not think will convince anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They say, it is a sister or daughter. The Member wants to make her a daughter-in-law or mother-in-law. Now he may please come to the point of border agitation.

Sri ANNA RAO GAMAMUKHI.—If their formula is applied, then all the Dravidian languages like Tamil and Telugu belong to us, and we can extend our borders into Madras and Andhra and gulp their territories. On that analogy. they will gulp Halya Supa, Karwar and everything. If this argument is stretched, I do not know whether after coming to Karwar, they will again stretch forward and come to Mangalore, because in Mangalore also there are many people who speak Konkani; they will futher say that Karwar, South Kanara and North Kanara are historically one and contiguous. At this rate, there will be no end to

(SRI ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI)

their claims. We must contain them where they are. We should never give scope to this idea. But, unfortunately, our Hon'ble Chief Minister has become a prey of circumstances, I do not know, as Sri Gopal Gowda said, whether he wants to play the dual role of protecting the pot of milk and also become the guardian of the cat; both positions cannot be reconciled. He cannot feel the cat and at the same time save the milk pot. This cannot be done at any rate.

This language formula could not be applied to Gujarat and Maharashtra while the bilingual Bombay State was divided. In this connection, I would like to read the relevant portions from the speech of our Defence Minister and the then Chief Minister of Bombay on the floor of the Legislature.' There was the following amendment to a clause:

> "Such villages on the border between the State of Gujarat and the State of Bombay as are found to have a majority of Gujarati speaking people and to be contiguous up to the State of Gujrat, the issue of majority being determined on the basis of a village as a unit."

This is the Pataskar formula so sought after and in accordance with it, the abovesaid amendment was put in the Bombay Council while Sri Chavan was piloting the Bill about the bifurcation of the bilingual State of Bombay. Then the reply of Sri Chavan, the then Chief Minister is as follows: I really appreciate it. He says:—

> "If we accept this amendment, it will create an anomalous position in the whole Act. It will create some sort of vacuum on the border between Gujrat and Maharashtra.
>
> "Part (b) of the Clause which is sought to be amended really proposes to accurately define the border between Maharashtra and Gujrat. If we have to provide some sort of a recommendation— may be to have a lingustic commission which may be appointed for the purpose as to on what basis the border should be decided, it will not be an act giving birth to new States but it will be some sort of principle giving birth to new controversies. That is an idea of the Act. The Act is called upon to create States. As such, I cannot accept the amendment."

The S. R. C S. Act also did not create any such controversy. All the arguments in favour of the Pataskar formula were thrown out by the Parliament; all those arguments were given a quietus. So this formula was again proposed in Parliament and rejected again. After that, the Union Home Minister speaking on the Act said that if there were any minor differences, they can be settled in the Zonal Councils and the Zonal Councils would give advice to the State Governments. That can be done even now. If this advice is not accepted by the State, then the whole matter ends there. Again, if the matter which cannot be settled through the Zonal Councils are taken up and referred to a Commission, it will give rise to many complications. If the whole thing which has been settled is raked up again, it will result in disharmony. In the words of Sri Y. B. Chavan himself, "it will be some sort of principle giving birth to new controversies." So, if this Commission is also appointed, it will give birth to new controversies in the States. As a result of the adoption of the Pataskar formula, the whole Mysore State will lose many of the areas If this formula is adopted in this case of Maharashtra we cannot change it in the case of Andhra. Now in the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly, a resolution to the effect that the areas which have gone as a result of the S. R. Act to other States, must be claimed by Andhra Pradesh Government, has been introduced. If that resolution is in a dormant state and a discussion on it has been postponed to a later stage, it is because the legislators there are watching the outcome of this dispute between Maharashtra and Mysore. If the Pataskar formula is accepted, it would automatically follow that they will take up that question in Andhra, and we will have to part with many of our areas. Of course, we will also get some Kannada-speaking areas if village is treated as a unit. On that basis, new controversies will be raised in the whole of India and so many things will have to be nullified. I do not think that would be a good thing for the future development of this country; and for peaceful living. The Chief Minister's stand, I think, is highly objectionable. We cannot support the stand taken by him, and the one man Commission should be scrapped, and should no longer be accepted by the State.

As far as the terms of reference to the proposed commission are concerned, I must say that just as he has committed a mistake by agreeing to the appointment of a commission, he has erred in saying that he is agreeable to engage with the Chief Minister of Maharashtra in talks in regard to the terms of reference. He ought to have rejected even that. Since our stand is against the appointment of one-man Commission, the reference to the Commission itself will become wrong. Therefore, I am highly against this proposal. I support the amendment which has been brought by my friend Sri Suryanarayana Rao.

5-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no amendment of Sri Suryanarayana Rao. It cannot be supported before it is brought before the House. I do not want to place myself in an awkward situation.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—It has been circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It may be circulated for information.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Provisionally admitted means, we can speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not said provisionally admitted. It is circulated for information. I have made it very very clear.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Then, the words "provisionally admitted" should not have been there !

Mr. SPEAKER.—I call upon hon'ble member Sri A. J. Doddameti to participate in the debate.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ (ರೋಣ್).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸೂಚಿತ ಏಕ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗವು ಅಕಾಲಿಕ, ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕ ಹಾಗೂ ಅವ್ಯವಹಾರಿಕ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇದೊಂದು ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧ ವಿಚಾರ ಸರಣಿಯೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅವರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಮೀಟಿಂಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರು ? ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಇದು ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಅವ್ಯವಾಹಾರಿಕ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧ ವಿಚಾರ ಸರಣಿಯೂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಸಮಯ ಇದನ್ನು ತಡೆದು ನಂತರ ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಾಗಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾದವರೂ ಏನು ಎಂದರೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ......

Mr. SPEAKER.—Would Sri Annarao, kindly point out to me where the substantive motion of Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao or his motion has been provisionally admitted ?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The amendments have been provisionally admitted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the motion of the hon'ble members ?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is provisionally admitted for being included in the agenda, not for debate. I have made it very clear.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—So, what has happened to them ? Let us be satisfied at least.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have made it abundantly clear that there is no data and enough data for coming to a conclusion. After hearing the Chief Minister, if there is anything, I may admit. But, it shall not be treated as having been admitted.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Then, am I to take it that the amendment is rejected ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may understand it in any manner he likes. After the debate is over, then under Rule 279 of the Rules of Procedure, if it is to be voted, the substantive motion is to be put to vote, at that time, I may consider them.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I am speaking about the amendment. If I have heard the Speaker say at the last occasion when this was moved, he said it is before the House. Am I to take it that it is admitted or not allowed ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Have I allowed it to be moved ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—You may refer to the proceedings of this House. I have been allowed to move it. The learned Speaker said that it is before the House. I leave it to you to reconsider it.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—After Sri Sivappa moved the Motion, the Speaker called upon Sri Suryanarayana Rao to move the amendment.

When the amendment was moved formally, the then Presiding Officer said that both the motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—And after that I came. Sri V. S. Patil raised a point of objection. He said an amendment is not admissible ; it changes the nature of the Motion before the House. With the motion before the House, there is no question of voting. When the amendment is taken in, there is the question of voting. Therefore, such an amendment is not admissible and as a result of prolonged discussion, substantive amendment was given notice of. I shall have it verified ; all the proceedings are there.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—If we go by precedent or practice, when the Speaker says that the matter is before the House for consideration, I take it that there is a Ruling, and no Point of Order could be raised on a Ruling. What Sri V. S. Patil did was, to raise the Point of Order after the presiding Speaker announced that the matter is before the House for consideration. Therefore, I was about to raise that point and you were pleased to come in. That was the stage from which you are proceeding.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall have the proceedings again brought to me. Let Sri A. J. Doddameti continue his speech.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸೂಚಿತ ಏಕ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗ ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಅತ್ಯಮೂಲ್ಯವಾದ ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಜನ ಜೀವನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿತ್ಯವೂ ಪರಿಣಾಮಕಾರಿಯಾದ ಅನೇಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರಿಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಲಕ್ಷ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಪಾಕೀಸ್ತಾನ ಹಾಗೂ ಚೀನಾ ದೇಶಗಳ ಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಗಭೀರವಾದ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ನಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ನಾಭಾವದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಳವಳ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೂ ದೇಶದ ಇತರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳೂ ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವನ್ನು ಹೊರತು ಪಡಿಸಿ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೇಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ? ದೇಶದ ಅನ್ನ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಅನ್ನ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಇಂತಹ ಮಹತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಶಾಂತ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾದಾಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಅಕಾಲಿಕ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಇದೇನೂ ಅಂತಹ ಮಹತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದವು. ಇನ್ನೂ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದ ಇತರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾಗಿ ಅವನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಎನ್ನಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಅಂತಹ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾದುದಾದರೂ ಹೇಗೆ ? ಮುಂಬೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಖಿಲ ಭಾರತ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಸೇರಿದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಪೂಜ್ಯ ಸೇನಾಪತಿ ಬಾಪಟ್ ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ನಿವಾಸದ ಮುಂದೆ ಉಪವಾಸ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ತೋರಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ಒಂದು ನಾಟಕ ಮಾಡಿದಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ತರಹ ನಾಟಕದೊಳಗೇ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಕರಗಿಸಿದರು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ, ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಬೌಂಡರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಿದುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ, ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಗಡಿ ವಿಸ್ತರಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕರೆಯುವುದು ನೆಟ್ಟಗೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದೇನಿದೆ ? ಅವರ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾದನಂತರ ಈ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸ್ವಭಾವ ಪರಿಚಯ ನನಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ

ಉಂಟು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿದುದು ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನನಗೆ ದುಃಖ ಮಾತ್ರವಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಇದು ಅವ್ಯವಹಾರಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕವಾದುದು ಎಂಬುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ......

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are not very much concerned with what transpired elsewhere. We are only concerned with the matters connected with this. The Hon'ble Member need not bring any personnel here who are not here to defend themselves. The best thing is to leave it at that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕೋರ್ಟನ್ನೋ ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದರ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಅದು ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿಗಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸವೋ ಒಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಗಡಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಗಡಿಯೋ—ಇದು ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗದ ರಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ಆಯೋಗದ ಮಾತು ಅವ್ಯವಹಾರಿಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂತಣ್‌ಕರ್ ಅವರೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಾವು political decision ಅಥವಾ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೆಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದು ಈಗ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ 66 ಮಂದಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದವರು ಕೇವಲ 26 ಮಂದಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಎದ್ದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೇ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪರಿವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದಾರೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ನಮ್ಮವರೂ ಸಹ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಳೆದರೆ ಇಂದಲ್ಲ, ನಾಳೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದೀತು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಗುಣಾವಗುಣಗಳನ್ನು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸತ್ಯಾಂಶವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದೇ ಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧ ವಿಚಾರವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಯಾವುದನ್ನೂ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡದೆ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಇತರೇ ಜನರು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಜೋರಾಗಿ ಕೂಗಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧವಾದ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧ ವಿಚಾರವೆಂದರೆ, ಏನು ಅಂದರೆ, ಯಾವದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಕೇಳಲಿ, ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಕೇಳಲಿ ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಈಗ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗಿದೆ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದಾದರೂ ಆಧಾರವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಂಥವರು, ಮುಖರ್ಜಿಯವರು, ಮೋತಿಲಾಲ್ ಅವರು ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ್ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಯರು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಓದಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಓದಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೇ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ, ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈಗ ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಿಟ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ

ನಾನು ಮೊದಲನೆಯವನಾಗುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರಿಟ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಹಾಕುವುದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅನೇಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೇ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಇವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ಆಯೋಗಗಳು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಲೇ ಇವೆ. 1924ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂಜ್ಯ ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟು ಬಂದಂಥ ಭೂಮಿ ಅದು ಪವಿತ್ರವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ ಆಗಲೇ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದವರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅಪೇಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. 1934ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರವಾಸ ಬಂದಾಗ ಆಗಲೂ ಬೆಳಗಾಂಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಭಾಷಾಂತರ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ, ಅಥವಾ ಮರಾಠಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂತು. ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣ ಭಾಷಾಂತರವಾಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಗಂಗಾಧರ ದೇಶಪಾಂಡೆ ಅವರು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಭಾಷಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಚಮತ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ಹರಿಜನ ಕೇರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಹುಡುಗರು ಗಾಂಧಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ತೆಗೆದರು. ಮರಾಠಿ ಹುಡುಗರು ಕೆಲವರು ಐದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮರಾಠಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆಗ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ you go to Poona ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದುದು, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಸಹಿಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, 1934 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವತಃ ನೋಡಿದೇನೆ ಇವತ್ತು ನಾನು ಮಹಾ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೋತಿಲಾಲ್ ನಹರೂ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಅಜ್ಜ. ಅವರು 1928 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಚನೆಯಾದಾಗಲೇ ಅವರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದೊಳಗೆ ಕೂಡಿವೆ ಎಂಬ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆಡಿದ್ದರು.

ಇನ್ನು 1943ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಧುರೀಣರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಜಾಜಿಯವರು ಬೆಳಗಾಂಗೆ ಬಂದರು. ಆಗಲೂ ಇದೇ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಅವರು ಕ್ವಿಟ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಚಳುವಳಿಯ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಳಗಾಂಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಮರಾಠಿ ಜನರು ಮರಾಠಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೂಗಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ನನಗೆ ಮರಾಠಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರು. ತಮ್ಮ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷ್ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಮರಾಠಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಎಂದು ಜಿಜ್ಞಾಸೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ತಾವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಭಾಷಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದು ನೂರಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಬೆಳಗಾಂನ ಇತಿಹಾಸವನ್ನು ನೋಡೋಣ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗುಂಜಿ ವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೆಲಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿವರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಅದು 17ನೇ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 1818ರ ಮುಂಬೈ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಕೋಡಿನ 21ನೇ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಬ್ರಿಟೀಷರು ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಆಕ್ರಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ನಂತರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದಿತು. ಆಗ ಏನಾಯಿತೆಂದರೆ, ಪುಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಹಮದನಗರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡಿಸಿ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯೆಂದು ಕರೆದರು. ಉಳಿದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಭಾಗವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದೇ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಬೊಂಬೆ ಕೋಡ್, ವಾಲ್ಯೂಮ್ 28ರಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಆಫ್ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವೆಂದೇ ಇದೆ. ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಕೂಡಿತ್ತೆಂದರೆ ಕಸಬಾ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ಸೇರಿದ್ದವು. ಧಾರವಾಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯೆಂದು ಬೇರೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. 1891ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 2650 ಇದ್ದಿತು. ತದನಂತರ ಅಂಗ್ರೇಜಿ ಲಾಡಾಯಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರು ವರ್ಚಸ್ಸು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹಲವಾರು ಮರಾಠಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಜನರು ಬಂದು ಬಂದು ಬೆಳಗಾಂನಲ್ಲಿ ನೆಲಸಿದರು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಜನರಿಂದ ತುಂಬಿತು. ನಂತರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ 1899 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಾಯಿತು. ತತ್‌ಪೂರ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಧಾರವಾಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಸಬಾ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಎರಡೂ ಸೇರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಆಫ್ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಇವನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೀವು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗೀತೆ? ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಇತಿಹಾಸವಿದೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂನೊಳಗೆ 97 ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕಛೇರಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವು ಯಾರಿಗಾಗಿ ಇವೆ? ಇಡೀ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಇವೆ.

ಅನೇಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಾಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಔದ್ಯೋಗಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು ನೀವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನವಿದ್ದರೆ, ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬಯಕೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಕೇವಲ ಭಾಷೆಯ ದುರಭಿಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಬೇಡಿ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವವರೆಂದರೆ ಕಿಸಾನ್ ಕೂಲಿಗಾರರ ಪಕ್ಷ. ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ನಿಮಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಯಾವ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬೇರೆ. ನೀವು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ತಲೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಸಾಮ್ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ ರಕ್ಷಣಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಂದರೆ, ಆಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಶಿವಾಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿ ಏನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಶಿವಾಜಿ ದೈವ ಭಕ್ತ. ಅವರ ಭಕ್ತಿಗೆ ನಾವು ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶಿವಾಜಿಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬೇಡಿಯೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ನೀವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಶಿವಾಜಿ ಮಹಾಪುರುಷನಿಗೆ ಹೋಲಿಸದೆ ಚೈನಾದ ಮಾವ್‌ತ್ಸೆ ತುಂಗಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಕಬೂಲಿ ಇದೆ. ನಿಶ್ಚಯವಾಗಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮಗೆ ಜಯ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರವಾರ. ಕಾರವಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಗಂಭೀರವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಳಗಾಂನವರು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕದಂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೈ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸ ತಾಳಿ. ಈ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಾರವಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇವರನ್ನು ಕೂಡಿದರು. ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇವರನ್ನು ಕೈ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನುಮೇಲೆ ಎತ್ತಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಡಿ. ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಜನರು ಇದನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲಾರರು. ಇದು ಕನಸಿನ ಮಾತು ಎಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಸಾವಿರ ಜನರು ಕೂಡಿ ಬಂದರೂ ಸಹ ಬೆಳಗಾಂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

(*Interruptions.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—For every sentence, Sri B. P. Kadam seems to be making a remark !

Sri B. P. KADAM.—The Hon'ble Member looks at me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I appeal to the Hon'ble Member, Sri Doddameti not to look at him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಅತ್ತ ಕಡೆ ನೋಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Let me make it clear. He pointed his finger towards me twice and uttered my name. I do not want his love. It will kill me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the midst of confusion, making love is prohibited. (*Laughter*).

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಇನ್ನು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿನ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಏಕಾಏಕಿ ಮಧ್ಯರಾತ್ರಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಜಗತ್ತೆಲ್ಲ ನಿದ್ರಿಸುವ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಬುದ್ಧದೇವ ದೇಶಾಂತರ ಹೋದ ವೇಳೆಗೆ, ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕರೆದು ಏಕ ಸದಸ್ಯ ಆಯೋಗ ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಶ್ಚಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಂಥ ವಿಪತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಎದುರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಆಯೋಗ ರಚನೆ ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧವಾದುದು, ಅಕಾರ್ಯಕವಾದುದು, ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕವಾದುದು, ವಿಚಾರಪೂರ್ಣವಾದುದಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆಂಧೋಲನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಏನೇನೋ ಅಪಕೀರ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಈ ಆಂದೋಳನ ನಿಶ್ಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಯಂ ಸ್ಫೂರ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಸಮೂಲವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಅವಿವೇಕಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಕೆಲವರು ಅಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಗೌಡ.—ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಧಿಕ್ಕಾರ ಎಂದು ನೀವೇ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಅದು ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕ ; ಅಕಾರ್ಯಕ ಮತ್ತು ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ತನಕ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇದ್ದು ಈಗ ಅವರು ಈ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಶಿವಪೂಜೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕರಡಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಕರಡಿಯ ಕೈಯ್ಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ಹೇಗೆ ಪಾರಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಾಸ್ತವಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ನಾಡಿನ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ, ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ, ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಪಿ. ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳೂ ಒಂದೇ. ಇದು ನಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದರೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಆಂಧ್ರದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನ ನಾನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಪಾಟಸ್ಕರ್ ಸೂತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದ ನಡುವೆ ಕೆಲವು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಹೋರಾಟವನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಧ್ಯ ರಾತ್ರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥಹ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

5-30 P.M.

ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಬಹಳ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪುನಃ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನರುಚ್ಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾರಣ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾ ಮಹಾ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮೇಧಾವಿಗಳಾದಂಥ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು ಈ ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಕಾಲದವರೆಗೆ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾಗ ವಿದರ್ಭ ಆಂದೋಳನದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಅಣೆಯವರು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂತನ್‌ಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ 100 ಕ್ಕೆ 100 ಮರಾಠಿಗರು. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಎತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದವರ ನಿಲುವು ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರವಂತರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ನಿಲುವು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕಾರವಾರ, ಬೆಳಗಾಂವ್ ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ಇವುಗಳು ಯಾವಕ್ಕೂ ಆಯೋಗದವರು ಕೈ ಹಾಕುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡೋಣ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೆಲವು ತಪ್ಪುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಕಾಸರಗೋಡು ಮುಂತಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಪೋಲಿಯೋವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಆ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಮರ್ಥ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅವು ಸಣ್ಣ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವು ಅದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಆಂಧ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರುಗಳ ಗಡಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಜೀವ ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಕಾಸರಗೋಡಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಕಣ್ಣು ಎದುರಿನಲ್ಲಿವೆ. ಕೇರಳವಾಗಲೀ ಮದ್ರಾಸಾಗಲೀ ಆಂಧ್ರವಾಗಲೀ ನಾವು ನಾವೇ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ನಿಶ್ಚಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಿರರ್ಥಕ. ಇಂಥಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮನೋಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಬೇಕು. ಕೇರಳ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ ತತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ನಂತರ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವಿ. ಗೌಡ.—ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಆಯೋಗವನ್ನ ನೇಮಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಅದು ಅಪ್ರಬುದ್ಧ. ಅಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕ ಅವ್ಯವಹಾರ್ಯ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಗಡಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಗಡಿ ಆಯೋಗ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಮಧ್ಯ ರಾತ್ರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಮಾಡಿದಂಥಾದ್ದು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕೂಟ ಕಡೆದ ಕಾಲ ಕೂಟ ವಿಷ. ಈ ಸಮುದ್ರಮಥನ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದಂತಹ ವಿಷವನ್ನ ನುಂಗುವಂತೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಉಗುಳುವಂತೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ನೀಲಕಂಠರಾಗಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಸಬೇಕು. ನೀಲಕಂಠರಾಗಿ ಇದರ ಕಾರ್ಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕಾರ್ಯವಾಪ್ತಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ? ಇದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕು. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬರೆದು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಆದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆದೀತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಬರೆದು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ.

1 1961ರ ಜನಗಣತಿಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಭಾಷಿಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನೇ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

2 ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪುನರ್ರಚನಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ್ವಯ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಗೊಂಡ ಎರಡು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ನಡುವಿನ ಸೀಮಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರವು ಎತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಎರಡು ಗಡಿಯಂಚುಗಳು ಕೂಡುವ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳ ಮೇರೆಯನ್ನಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇರಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು.

3 ಕೊಂಕಣಿಯು ಒಂದು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಭಾಷೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮರಾಠಿ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧವೇನೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಕೊಂಕಣಿ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಜನರನ್ನು ಮರಾಠಿ ಮಾತಾಡುವ ಜನರೆಂದು ಗ್ರಹಿಸಬಾರದು.

4 ರಾಜ್ಯಪುನರ್ರಚನಾ ವಿಧೇಯಕವು ಸಂಸತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ನಿಷ್ಕರ್ಷಿಸದೆ ಸೀಮೆ ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ನಿಷ್ಕರ್ಷಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಎತ್ತತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ.

5 ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪುನರ್ರಚನಾ ಆಯೋಗದವರು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿದ ತತ್ವಗಳನ್ನೇ ಈಗಲೂ ಸಹ ವಿವಾದಾತ್ಮಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಬೇಕು.

6 ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರ್ಪಡೆಯಾದ ನಿಮಿತ್ತದಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಡಳಿತೆಯ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲತೆಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದೋ ತೊಂದರೆಯೋ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಕಾರಣವೇ ಒಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸುವಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಯಿಂದ ಆಗುವ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳು ಕ್ಷುಲ್ಲಕವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು.

7 ಜನತೆಯ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣದ ವಿಷಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ನಿರ್ವಿಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅದೇ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿತ ಅಂಶವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. (ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಕೆಲವೊಂದು ವರ್ಗದ ಜನರು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನೇ ಜನತೆಯ ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆಯೆಂದು ಗ್ರಹಿಸಬಾರದು. ಅದು ಮನೋವ್ಯಪರೀತ್ಯದಿಂದ ಬಂದದ್ದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಮಹತ್ವ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು).

8 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಹಿನ್ನಾಡಿನೊಂದಿಗೇ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಲ್ಲದೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಬೇರ್ಪಡಿಸಬಾರದು.

9 ನಗರಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳನ್ನು ಭಾಷಿತ ಬಹುಮತ ಅಲ್ಪಮತದ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಬಾರದು. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಶೇಷ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಾಮರ್ಶಿಸಬೇಕು. ನಗರಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿದ ಅವುಗಳ ಸುತ್ತುಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂದರೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರೋದ್ಯಮ, ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೋದ್ಯಮ, ಕಸುಬುಗಳು, ಬ್ಯಾಂಕುಗಳು, ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು, ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಇನ್ನಿತರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಕಟ್ಟು ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನಗರಗಳ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಿಂದ ಬೇರ್ಪಡಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗಬಹುದಾದ ಮೂಲೋತ್ಪಾಟನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮದಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗುವ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು

ಹಾಗೂ ಮೂರೋತ್ಪಾಟನೆದಿಂದ ಆ ನಗರಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಬಹುದಾದ ಹಾನಿಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೇ ವಿನಾ ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯ ಸಣ್ಣ ವರ್ಗವನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು.

10 ಭಾಷಾ ತತ್ವ ಅರ್ಥಾತ್ ಜನತೆಯ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯ (ಜನತೆಯ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯನ್ನೇ ಭಾಷಾತತ್ವದ ಪರ್ಯಾಯ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ) ಅಂಶವು ಆಡಳಿತ ಸೌಕರ್ಯದ ಅಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಗ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಂದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯವಿರಬೇಕು.

11 ರಾಜ್ಯಪುನರ್ರಚನಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಎರಡೂ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ನಡುವೆ ಎಳೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಮೇರೆಯ ಆಚೆ ಈಚೆಯ ಬದಿಯ ಹತ್ತು ಮೈಲಿನ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯ ಕಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅಂಥ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಸಕ್ತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಅಂದರೆ (ಅ) ಕಳೆದ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದ ಅನುಭವದ ಮೇರೆಗಳ ಏನಾದರೂ ತೊಂದರೆ, ತಾಪತ್ರಯ ಅಥವಾ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯ ಅವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರಬೇಕು. (ಬ) ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಅಗತ್ಯಗಳಿಂದಾಗಲಿ, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಅಗತ್ಯಗಳಿಂದಾಗಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷಣೀಯವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿರಬೇಕು. (ತ) ಉಭಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳೂ ಅಂಥ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕು. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೋದನಂತರ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಾರೀ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತೆ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಯಾವುದು ? ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗದೇ ಇರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಯಾವುದು ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನೇ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ, ನಿಪ್ಪಾಣಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯಮಾಡಿರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬಾರ್ಡರ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಣ್ಣಪುಟ್ಟ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಳು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ. ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಮ್ಮತ ಆಗದೇಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಾರೀ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಅಪ್ರತಿಹತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, 3 ಮಂದಿ 4 ಮಂದಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರು, ತಿಳಿದವರು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಇದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಟರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ರೆಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಟರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ರೆಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ಸಹ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇಬ್ಬರು ಒಪ್ಪುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು, ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಏನಾದರೂ ಅವಸರ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಚೈನಾ ಪಾಕೀಸ್ತಾನವನ್ನು ಎದುರಿಸಲು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸೈನ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಲಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚೈನಾ ಪಾಕೀಸ್ತಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದುದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮಿಲಿಟರಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಹುಡುಗಾಟಿಕೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿದರೆ ದ್ರಾವಿಡ ಚಳುವಳಿಗೆ ಆಮಂತ್ರಣಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹುಚ್ಚು ಸಾಹಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕದೆ ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗೆ ಕೈಹಾಕಲಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I sent to Sri Suryanarayana Rao, the papers as requested. I shall read them so that the House might know. This was what happened as recorded and I have no reason to think there is anything wrong.

"**Mr. CHAIRMAN.**—Sri Suryanarayana Rao can move his amendment now.

Sri SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That at the end of the motion, add the words and on such consideration, the House recommends to the Government to urge on the Government of India, to drop the proposed setting up of the one-man commission."

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Amendment moved. Now both the motion and the amendment are before the House. I call upon Sri Krishna to speak.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I have also moved amendments.

"**Sri V. S. PATIL.**—Sir, I have also moved amendments. I have handed them over to the Secretary and the Speaker had promised to consider it.

Chairman (SRI Y. MANJAIAH SHETTY).—Those amendments have not been considered and when those amendments are considered they will be taken up.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—They have not been rejected.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Sri Krishna may continue his speech.! Then, there is the speech of Sri Krishna going on and Sri V. S. Patil raises a point of order. After he spoke, at that time I took the Chair. Then Sri Anna Rao also participated. He said :

" Sir, the Speaker after the completion of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and before the seconder began, a member who had given notice of the motion was allowed to move the amendment to the motion. It is an amplification of the original resolution itself. So, this admplified resolution in the shape of an amendment was moved with the permission of the Speaker by Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao and the Speaker was pleased to say that along with the original motion, the other amendment or motion moved by Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao was also before the House and both of them may be discussed together. That was the purport of the Ruling given by the Speaker. Now, the objection raised by the Hon ble member Sri V. S. Patil is under Rule 279 of the Rules of Procedure. Here. It is clearly stated that the House will discuss the main motion and before the question shall be put or the conclusion of the debate, a member can also move a substantive motion in appropriate terms to be approved by the Speaker. The Speaker has approved the motion moved by Sri Suryanarayana Rao and it has become already the property of the House. "

Is that correct ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will read further :

" The Speaker took the Chair at 4-20 P.M.

" **Mr. SPEAKER.**—When did the Speaker approve ? "

"**Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.**—Just now"

You must have the ideas very clear : whether the amendment you are talking of that was moved or whether it is the substantive motion."

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO Sir, at this stage.................

Mr. SPEAKER.—I did not say 'at this stage'. Kindly tell me what was before the House. I want at least now to make the position clear. Is it the amendment that he moved or the substantive motion that he moved :

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I have not been able to move the substantive motion because the Speaker has not yet permitted. What I moved was only the amendment at that stage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will read the original.

> " Under rule 279 a substantive motion was moved. This has happened when you were not in the seat. This is a substantive motion which I have already given notice of. That is what I have moved."

What is this the Hon. Member is talking ? Please hear further :

> "The Speaker was pleased to say that both of them are before the House and the House started discussing. ...There was a little doubt in my mind with regard to the admissibility of the amendment and therefore, I have given immediately a substantive motion under article 279 thinking the technicality may come in the way of the House in expressing its opinion on the subject matter before the House. Therefore I originally intended to move the substantive motion and since I did not properly put it in a proper form, I corrected it myself and put it in the proper form."

Then, I have observed :

> " It is still in my hands and it has not been admitted. It has not been circulated to the members and a copy has not been supplied to them."

So, that is not before the House and it cannot be moved. The only thing that was moved was the amendment which he himself did not want to.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—That may be the impression of Sri Suryanarayana Rao; we are not a party.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly remember that the paper bears the signature of the member. Now to rise and say that he is not a party and Sri Suryanarayana Rao may be a party and his amendment is not moved what is this ?

I will read further: Hon'ble Member Suryanarayana Rao was addressing and said:

> " Therefore I originally intended to move the substantive motion and since I did not properly put it in a proper form I corrected it myself and put it in the proper form. Only for clarification and amplification of the motion that is already moved by the Leader of the Opposition, this substantive

(MR. SPEAKER)

> motion is moved. Therefore, what I have moved is only a substantive motion enabling this House on the subject not to plead or blame any body, but to kindly reject the point of order raised."

On that I have rejected. I will proceed forward: I said—

> "Sri Suryanarayana Rao has given notice of an amendment. Now he pleads the amendment may not be in order. He wants to put it on a safe ground by sending a resolution. It is still in my hands and it has not been admitted. It has not been circulated to the members and a copy has not been supplied to them. Sri Suryanarayana Rao himself entertains doubt whether the motion of the type is in proper form. If the amendment which might have come in the shape of substantive motion is rejected on certain principles, the matter ends there. If he wants a ruling on that, I have no objection.
>
> "**Sri V. S. PATIL.**—What about the point of order?
>
> "**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I will give a ruling tomorrow."

Therefore, I have made it very clear.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—You have said about the substantive motion afterwards. Before that, what I have submitted is that the amendment has become the property of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, Sri Anna Rao has raised a point that it is a property of the House and therefore he says, his amendment is before the House. My answer to him is, he has not moved it. Amendment has not been moved by Sri Anna Rao that is perfectly clear. Amendment has been moved by Sri Suryanarayana Rao. Sri Suryanarayana Rao after that made his position very clear.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If the amendment stands in the name of four persons, you cannot call upon all the four persons to move the amendment. Here, what has happened is, Sri Suryanarayana Rao moved himself and all of us are movers of the amendments. If Sri Suryanarayana Rao expresses any doubt about that amendment, we are not for it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a very interesting position of law. If Sri Suryanarayana Rao moves, he moves on behalf of all.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sri Suryanarayana Rao submitted that he was reading the proceedings of Lok Sabha. He was saying, both the substantive motion along with the amendment can be done in the course of the proceedings of the House.

6-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Those proceedings also I will pass on to the Members to read. I said, the procedure that has been followed there and the correct interpretation of rule 279 is, "after the mover of the resolution of this debate" where it is only "taking into consideration" and debate will proceed—there will be no question put. Only question that is put is the substantive motion to be given notice of in appropriate form, to be approved by the Speaker. Now, Sri Bhimanna may continue.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—After all this discussion, I am still in doubt what we have to discuss, whether we are discussing substituted motion or the original motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As to whether these motions should be admitted or not, I am not in a position to decide. I have held them over. After hearing the Chief Minister some position may emerges.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Are we to speak on the first motion or on the second motion or on the amendment? On what motion we have to speak is not clear and that is the confusion created. One is the original motion moved by the leader of the opposition, second amendment given notice of by Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao and he has again given a substantial motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already made it clear that the motion is so wide enough that everything is covered and everything can be covered. As to whether I should allow the substantial motion or not, I am withholding consent because appropriate words have to be considered by me and then alone it can be put before the House.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Today is the third day we are discussing and we expected that in consultation with the leader of the House you will come to some conclusion and place some concrete proposals before us. If it is converted into a resolution, then we must be allowed to give our amendments and so many other questions will arise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would only mention that as members are aware tomorrow is perhaps the only day we can discuss this. There will be only four hours. Unless we sit in the morning, it will not be sufficient for the members.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Time may be extended.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not unless the House compels me. I will carry out the wishes of the House. I will not take the responsibility on myself.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—One more day is essential.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Wednesday, 27th July 1966.